

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,297	11/14/2003	Chih Hao Yiu	4145JE	5206
75	90 05/28/2004		EXAM	INER
Chih Hao Yiu & Chih Hsiung Huang			GRAHAM, MARK S	
P.O. Box 63-99 Taichung, 40			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TAIWAN	•		3711	

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			^ \			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	101			
•	10/715,297	YIU ET AL.	<i>\</i> \			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark S. Graham	3711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu.  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of third d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ate, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered time ITHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	is action is non-final.					
•	,—					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the applicatio	n.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure:  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A ority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date	0.450)			
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	8) 5) Notice of Ir 6) Other:	nformal Patent Application (PT	U-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/715,297

Art Unit: 3711

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jancik.

Claims 1-3 are clearly anticipated.

Concerning claim 4, Jancik's computer or microprocessor would inherently include a circuit board.

Regarding claim 8, there would inherently be an attaching device to attach the line generator to the dartboard/supporting surface.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jancik in view of Carney. Jancik discloses the claimed device with the exception of the details of the line generating device. However, as disclosed by Carney it is known when generating a reference line for a game device to use a device such as that claimed. Jancik makes clear that any known such device may be used. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3711

art seeking a suitable generating device for Jancik's game to have used one such as Carney's, which has been shown to be effective for generating a reference line for a game.

Aubusson et al. has been cited for interest because it discloses a similar device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark S. Graham at Mark S. Grahem
Nark S. Examiner
Sympany Examiner telephone number 703-308-1355.

MSG 5/24/04